

A BALĀĠĪ APPROACH TO SOME GRAMMATICAL ŠAWĀHID

Ramzi Baalbaki

The American University of Beirut

It is generally accepted that Arab grammarians were predominantly concerned with structure and form — especially case-endings, uttered and elided operants, and the syntactic function of words — and rarely resorted to the criterion of meaning as the main arbiter in grammatical analysis. Despite some differences between grammarians in their emphasis on structural and formal (i.e. *lafẓī*) considerations or on meaning, preference of the first over the latter took place at a fairly early stage in the history of Arabic grammar — a tendency which certainly grew with time, and eventually tarnished the image of grammarians and lost them their credibility.

The failure of the grammarians in interpreting linguistic data primarily in accordance with meaning rather than the formal considerations they employed — let alone their inability to come up with a coherent grammatical theory based on meaning — is the main reason for the emergence of the discipline of *balāġa*. But this new discipline which evolved as a reaction to the shortcomings of *naḥw*, has its very roots embedded in *naḥw*. Not only were the main subjects of *balāġī* study derived from grammatical works,¹ but most *balāġī* authors were grammarians as well, and some of them have works in both disciplines, totally adopting the *naḥwī* approach in *naḥw* and then resorting to the *balāġī* perspective in *balāġa*. A stunning example is no other than al-Ġurġānī who, despite his uncompromising attack on the grammarians and his departure from their methods of syntactical analysis in his *Dalā'il al-'Iḡāz*, wrote a number of grammatical works with hardly any deviation from the traditional theory common to all authors on grammar. His *al-'Awāmil al-mi'a an-naḥwiyya* is a clear instance of his acceptance of the backbone of their grammatical theory; that is, the *'awāmil*, and his other published grammatical work, *al-Muqtaṣid*, which is one of his two commentaries on the *'Iḡāz* of 'Abū 'Alī al-Fārisī,² is not in any significant way different in approach from that of the so-called "traditional" authors representing the mainstream of Arab grammatical writings. It can be safely argued, as Zahrān does in his introduction to *al-'Azharī's* commentary on al-Ġurġānī's *al-'Awāmil al-mi'a an-naḥwiyya*,³ that al-Ġurġānī's legacy was transmitted in two distinct channels, firstly that of purely traditional grammar (*al-ġānīb an-naḥwī at-taqlīdī al-ḥālis*), and secondly that of *balāġa* where his works fluctuate from the traditional methods to the original application of his syntactical theory.

¹ Among the subjects which Šbawayhi touches upon and which became characteristic of *balāġī* study are *ḥadf*, *ziyāda*, *ḍikr*, *'idmār*, *taqdīm* and *ta'ḥīr*, *istiḥdām*, *qasr*, *faṣl* and *waṣl*, *taṣḥīn*, *isti'drā*, *kināya*, *ta'kid al-madh bi-mā yuṣbiḥ ad-ḍamm*, *taḡrīd*, etc. For a detailed list of such subjects in the works of Šbawayhi, al-Mubarrad, Ṭa'lab, and others, see 'A. Q. Ḥusayn (1975:54-5; 128-9; 205-7; 231-2).

² His other commentary is a much more expanded work called *al-Muġnī*. See Ibn al-'Anbārī, *Nuḥa* 265.

³ al-Ġurġānī, *'Awāmil* 31-3.

Although the study of *balāġa* was eventually plagued with methodological rigidity and sheer prescriptiveness — as is evident in the work of someone like as-Sakkākī, for example — its early stages represent, in several ways, a serious departure from grammatical concerns accompanied by a clear definition of its corpus. We thus know of no work which presents a problem in classification under *naḥw* or *balāġa*, due to the clear-cut distinction in subject, classification, and analysis. In an earlier study,⁴ the present author tried to examine the differences in syntactical analysis between Sībawayhi and al-Ġurġānī, being the two key figures in *naḥw* and *balāġa* respectively. Without delving into individual differences and idiosyncrasies, the results of that study seem to hold true generally for other grammarians and rhetoricians. Based partly on that comparison and partly on further observations, the main differences between the syntactical analysis of the grammarians and that of the rhetoricians, as sometimes applied to identical linguistic material, can be summarized in the following points, and in broadly generalized terms:

1. Grammarians are usually more inclined to the analysis of structure, especially the syntactic relations between parts of the utterance from the point of view of their theory on operants, while rhetoricians show more concern for meaning generated from various syntactic relations within the utterance. Indeed '*ilm al-ma'ānī*' — which as a term and a subject in its own right is inconceivable in the *naḥwī* tradition given its methods and concerns — rests mainly on the meaning dimension of *ḥabar*, *'iṣṣā* and *'iṣnād*. Even with later authors, such chapters as '*aḥwāl al-musnad 'ilayhi*' and '*aḥwāl al-musnad*'⁵ are crowded with observations on meaning, the extent of which is not even remotely challenged in any grammar book, and are practically free from the study of the formal aspect of syntactic relations, such as the function of particles and the restoration of supposedly elided parts.⁶ The other two branches of *balāġa*; namely, '*ilm al-bayān*' and '*ilm al-badī'*' similarly thrive on the scrutiny of meaning and guard against purely formal considerations.

2. Grammarians divide their subject-matter according to their theory of regimen — the focal point of their syntactic study — hence the traditional arrangement of nouns under *marfū'āt*, *manṣūbāt* and *maġnūrāt*, and of verbs under *manṣūb* and *maġzūm*.⁷ Their very terms for these parts reveal their concern for regimen, based on the relation between an *'āmīl* and a *ma'mūl*, and due to this concern, whole chapters of grammar are arbitrarily classified under one of the above divisions. One of the more flagrant of such arbitrary classification is that *nidā'* comes under *manṣūbāt*, despite the fact that the largest part of its corpus has a characteristic *ḍamma*,

⁴ R. Baalbaki (1983) esp. 12 ff.

⁵ See, for example, al-Qazwīnī, *Talḥīṣ* 53 ff and 101 ff, and as-Sakkākī, *Miftāḥ* 175 ff and 205 ff.

⁶ Note how al-Qazwīnī refers his reader to '*ilm an-naḥw*' when he touches upon particles and avoids discussing their functions, restricting his argument to their meanings; see *Talḥīṣ* 109.

⁷ Verbs in the indicative are not assigned a separate *bāb* by the grammarians, witness their concern for '*awāmīl*' which dictated the study of verbs under the influence of an operant, but not of the *marfū'*. Unlike verbs, nouns in the nominative are assigned a special *bāb*, but only as a framework for the study of the regimen of those particles that are introduced to a nominal sentence; i.e. the so-called *naḥwī*. Incidental discussion of indicative verbs in grammar occurs in the sections on the predicate, the circumstantial accusative, the similarity between the active participle and the *muḍārr'*, etc.

because of the grammarians' assumption of a verb *'unādī* to which they ascribe regimens of the *munādā* in *maḥall*, thus causing the *munādā* to become a direct object, hence in the realm of *maṣṣūbūt*. Conversely, the theory of regimen plays no role whatsoever in the setup of Arabic rhetoric. This is evident not only in those rhetorical subjects which have no parallels in grammar, such as *tašbīḥ*, *kināya*, *isti'āra*, *ṭibāq*, *tawriya*, etc., but also in subjects common to both disciplines. It is strange indeed that the grammarians — at least after the formative stages of the second and third centuries — were so much preoccupied by their theory of regimen that they did not assign separate chapters for a number of basic grammatical issues, and even for some parts of speech. Nowhere do we find, for example, a separate grammatical chapter in verbal *'isnād* and nominal *'isnād*, or on the change of meaning from *ḥabar* to *'inšā'*. More striking still is that grammarians touch on several parts of speech casually in different chapters of their regimen-oriented approach. Thus while rhetoricians discuss negation particles as a subject in its own right, grammarians mention each of those particles in the chapter under which it is classified according to regimen, and so *laysa* is with the sisters of *kāna*, *lāta* with the sisters of *'inna*, generic *lā* in a separate entity usually annexed to *'inna*, *lan* with the subjunctive, and *lam* with the jussive. Similarly, interrogative particles, which form an independent topic in rhetoric, are dispersed in grammar over a number of places (e.g. *'idāfa*, *šarf*, *zarf*) where the wide range of their meanings and usage is overshadowed, if not totally obliterated, by the grammarians' concern for the formal aspects of these particles.

3. Grammarians impose their own criteria on the structure of the sentence by relying heavily on suppletive insertion (*taqdīr*) to restore the "missing" parts of the utterance, while rhetoricians completely ignore such practice and depart in their analysis from the "surface structure" so to speak. *Sībawayhi* has several chapters on structures from which verbs were supposedly elided and hence have to be restored,⁸ frequently contradicting the aim of the speaker in his original utterance.⁹ As a result, the study of grammar became widely removed from the given point of departure; i.e. the utterance, and at times relied more on abstraction than on actual usage, while rhetoric mostly tried to detect the meaning of a particular context from the very structure through which the speaker chose to convey meaning. For instance, the construction *'a-zaydan taḍribu* in rhetoric has a meaning very different from that of the construction *'a-taḍribu zaydan*, while the restoration by the grammarians of a verb immediately following the interrogative particle effectively shatters this difference, sacrificing meaning for externally-imposed considerations. It should be noted here that the dissatisfaction some authors have expressed with *taqdīr* was always justly directed against the grammarians and not against the rhetoricians.

4. Grammarians are much less concerned than rhetoricians with nuances of meaning particular to different constructions. For grammarians, the two constructions *zaydun al-muntaliqu* and *al-muntaliqu zaydun* are interchangeable because both the

⁸ See his discussion of *šarf* (I, 67), *istifḥām* (I, 64-9; 459), *nafy* (I, 72-5), and *'amr* and *nahy* (I, 69).

⁹ In a construction like *zaydan idribhu*, *Sībawayhi* restores a verb before the noun, proposing *'idrib zaydan idribhu*, which is not in line with the speaker's aim of using a structure different from *idrib zaydan*, for whereas the latter specifies the action to be directed to *zayd*, the former specifies who is to be the object of hitting. Cp. this and other examples in Baalbaki (1983:20-2).

subject and predicate in each are definite,¹⁰ the only difference being what they call 'ināya or ihtimām.¹¹ Similar sentences beginning with a *nāsīl*, such as *kāna zaydun 'ahūka* and *kāna 'ahūka zaydan*, receive the same treatment by the grammarians.¹² The lengthy discussion on such constructions in grammatical works¹³ is stunning because its richness in details and *šawāhid* is undermined by total insensitivity to nuances of meaning which reflect the speaker's aim in his exact choice of words. The rhetoricians, however, tried to fill this gap which came to form an independent subject of inquiry known as *'ahwāl al-musnad 'ilayhi* and *'ahwāl al-musnad*, and was based on the stipulation that any difference in *lafz* entails change in meaning¹⁴ regardless of the criteria imposed by the grammarians to suit their methods of analysis and general theory. In one of the most bitter attacks al-Ġurġānī made on the grammarians, he accuses them of failing to discover nuances of meaning (*furūq* and *wuġūh*) in a single subject, and asserts that their reader can do without what they have to offer but badly needs that which they ignored.¹⁵

The question of *šawāhid* can serve as a useful framework for the comparative study of *naḥw* and *balāġa*, and is of particular importance since it is only in this area that the subject matter in both disciplines is so common. One should hasten to say that the approach of the grammarians and rhetoricians to the *šawāhid* confirms the points of difference between them as discussed above. However, this matter is too complicated to be explained away merely as a straightforward dichotomy, and it is the aim of this paper to show that despite the schism in methodology between the two groups, one can still detect instances where certain grammarians show a considerable degree of manoeuvre by relinquishing their otherwise basic concern for *lafz*, and resorting to a more meaning-based interpretation of linguistic data, much more characteristic of the rhetoricians' style. It is these instances that demonstrate grammar's claim to the study of meaning, which was unfortunately abandoned, thus uprooting this study from its natural setting and opening the way for a new discipline with a fresh look at old material.

The following examples should suffice to stress the major difference in approach to *šawāhid* by the two groups before we examine the more intricate cases in which some grammarians give priority to meaning over form and theory:

1. 'Abū n-Naġm al-Ġīlī's line: *qad 'ašbaḥat 'ummu l-hiyāri taddāfī * 'alayya danban kulluhu lam 'ašna'ī* is quoted by the grammarians with two different readings

¹⁰ Their term for this is *mutasāwiyān fī t-ta'rīf wa-t-tankīr*, hence the interchangeability also of *zaydun qā'imun* and *qā'imun zaydun*. See the grammatical issues on this subject in al-Suyūṭī, *Hamf* I, 102 ff.

¹¹ See al-Ġurġānī's refutation of the grammarians' reliance on 'ināya and ihtimām in *Dalā'il* 84.

¹² This probably originates from Sibawayhi's statement (*Kūṭab* I, 24): *'wa-iddā kānd ma'rifatan fa-'anta bi-l-hiyār 'ayyuhumā mā ġa'altahu fā'ilan raḥa'atuh wa-našabta l-'aḥar*".

¹³ As in Ibn Ya'qūb, *Šarḥ* I, 92 ff, Ibn 'Aqīl, *Šarḥ* I, 227 ff, and al-Suyūṭī, *Hamf* I, 101 ff.

¹⁴ The clearest formulation of this principle is al-Ġurġānī's assertion that it is wrong to suppose that *taqdīm* and *ta'ḥīr* is sometimes *muftāḍ* and sometimes not, and his insistence that any such change is necessarily significant in meaning. See *Dalā'il* 86-7.

¹⁵ *Dalā'il* 85. See other examples of al-Ġurġānī's ridicule of the grammarians' superficial analysis in Baalbaki (1983:15-6).

of *kull*: the nominative and the accusative,¹⁶ and they argue that both forms are metrically acceptable. It is obvious that the grammarians here admit these two forms because both lend themselves to proper *ʾrāb*, regardless of meaning, as *kullu* would be a subject, the predicate of which is *lam ʾašnaʿi*, while *kulla* would be a fronted or preposed (*muqaddam*) direct object of *ʾašnaʿi*. In rhetoric, on the other hand, the criterion of meaning rather than *ʾrāb* is given predominance, and the use of the accusative in *kulla* becomes inadmissible. As al-Ġurġānī (*Dalāʾil* 215) points out, the nominative expresses the poet's denial of any *ḍanb*, totally or partially (*lā qalīlan wa-lā kaṭīran*), while the accusative is contrary to what the poet means since it implies an admission of partial guilt. In other words, the nominative indicates *ʿumūm as-salb*, and the accusative *salb al-ʿumūm*.¹⁷

2. Two lines by al-Farazdaq usually cited together are: *ʾilā malikīn mā ʾummuhu min Muḥārībīn * ʾabūhu wa-la kānat Kulaybun tušāhīruh* and *wa-mā miṭluhu fī n-nāsi ʾillā mumallakan * ʾabū ʾummihi ḥayyūn ʾabūhu yuqāribuh*. Both lines are quoted by rhetoricians as examples of verbal complexity (*at-taʿqīd al-laḥẓī*), one of three major features, the absence of which is a prerequisite for a structure to be described as *balġ*, the other two being *ḍaʿf at-taʿlīf* and *tanāfir al-kalimāt*.¹⁸ Grammarians, however, cite the two lines without reference to this feature,¹⁹ as a *šāhid* on the fronting of the predicate (*taqḍīm al-ḥabar*), and are satisfied with indicating the grammatical function of each of its components. Indeed, Ibn Ġinnī goes as far as proclaiming that the structure of the first is correct or straightforward (*mustaqīm*) and free from disarrangement (*lā ḥabṭa fīhi*).²⁰

3. ʿAbdallāh b. Hammām as-Salūlī's line: *fa-lammā ḥašītu ʾaẓāfirahum * naġawtu wa-ʾarhanuhum Mālika* recurs in a number of grammatical sources as a *šāhid* on the usage of *ḥāl* with an imperfect verb in the affirmative.²¹ Such a verb, according to these sources, cannot be preceded by the circumstantial *wāw*, as one would say *ġāʾa zaydun yaḍḥaku*, and not *ʾġāʾa zaydun wa-yaḍḥaku*, and so constructions like *naġawtu wa-ʾarhanuhum* and *qumtu wa-ʾašukku ʿaynahu* are interpreted by supplying a subject, the predicate of which would be the imperfect, leaving the

¹⁶ Authors who mention the two possibilities include Sībawayhi (*Kiṭāb* I, 44), al-Farrāʾ (*Maʿānī* II, 95), Ibn Ġinnī (*Ḥaṣṣāʾiṣ* III, 303-4), and al-Baġdādī (*Ḥizāna* I, 174-5).

¹⁷ This is smartly formulated by al-Baġdādī (*Ḥizāna* I, 174-5) who contrasts the position of the grammarians represented by Sībawayhi with that of the *bayḍiyyūn* or *ahl al-bayān*, and unsurprisingly sides with the former.

¹⁸ al-Qazwīnī, *Talḥīf* 26 ff., and al-ʿAbbāsī's *Maʿādhid* I, 43-4. In his *ʿUmda* (II, 266-7), Ibn Rašīq quotes ar-Rummānī's assertion that complexity (*ʾiškāl al-kalām*) is due to three causes: departure from normality, using longer than necessary expressions, and the use of homonyms, and that all three concur in the line *wa-mā miṭluhu* etc..., the first being embodied in the bad arrangement of words, the second in using *ʾabū ʾummihi* instead of *ḥalīhi*, and the third in using *ḥayy* which could mean either *ʾqabīla* or a "living creature".

¹⁹ See Ibn Fāris, *Kiṭāb aš-šif* 109; Ibn Ġinnī, *Ḥaṣṣāʾiṣ* II, 394; Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī* 116; al-ʿAynī, *Maqāṣid* I, 555; and as-Suyūṭī, *Ham* I, 118.

²⁰ *Ḥaṣṣāʾiṣ* II, 394. Cp. I, 329 where Ibn Ġinnī says that the line *wa-mā miṭluhu* etc... is unjustified, but still insists that its meaning is apparent.

²¹ See Ibn as-Sikkīnī, *ʾIslāḥ* 231; Ibn ʿAqīl, *Šarḥ* I, 656; al-Ušmūnī, *Šarḥ* 256; al-ʿAynī, *Maqāṣid* III, 190; and as-Suyūṭī, *Ham* I, 246.

nominal sentence itself to act as the circumstantial accusative. Rhetoricians, however, have a different interpretation: the *wāw* here is not circumstantial but copulative,²² thus *fa-'arhanuhum* is equivalent to *fa-rahantuhum*.²³ This interpretation is in line with the rhetoricians' avoidance of suppletive insertion, which is bound to change the construction, and hence the meaning. Furthermore, the imperfect would indicate continuous action,²⁴ and is therefore inappropriate in this context unless it is interpreted as perfect.

4. The line attributed to al-Farazdaq or 'Amr b. Ma'dī Karib: *qad 'alimat Salmā wa-ḡārātuhā * mā qattara l-fārisa 'illā 'anā* provides a good example for the difference in interests between grammarians and rhetoricians: while grammarians investigate the formal aspect of the construction and the usage of the independent pronoun after *'illā* without the slightest consideration for meaning,²⁵ rhetoricians delve into the meaning of the constructions *mā ... illā* and the nuances it takes in different contexts.²⁶ al-Ḥurḡānī differentiates in meaning between constructions like *mā ḡā'anī 'illā zaydun*, where the speaker denies the coming of anyone other than *zayd*, and those like *mā qultu l-yawma 'illā mā qultuhu 'amsi bi-'aynihi*, where the speaker means no such denial but stresses that what he said on two different days is indeed identical. Thus, *mā qattara l-fārisa 'illā 'anā* does not mean that no one else did so, but that the speaker asserts that he did. With such accuracy in determining meaning, unparalleled in grammar, it surely becomes irrelevant whether *'illā* is followed by an independent or a dependent pronoun!

The schism between the two disciplines need not be stressed any further, and should be considered as a major landmark in the formation and development of Arabic linguistic sciences. But there remains, as we pointed out earlier, instances which demonstrate that some grammarians — in the various stages of the history of grammar — did offer meaning-oriented interpretation of linguistic material in which they ignored their basic concern for *lafz*. This is, of course, not to say that the grammarians neglected the meaning of utterances except in such instances, but it is in their dispersed comments and observations on these examples that one detects, if not a trend or a clear inclination of theirs then a remnant of their participation in the field of *'ilm al-ma'ānī* which belongs to grammar itself by virtue of its inclusion of the study of syntax. It is on this organic relationship between *'ilm al-ma'ānī* and *'ilm an-naḥw* that much of al-Ḥurḡānī's theory rests, as he established that *naẓm*, which for him is the centrepiece of meaning, is no more than organizing structure according

²² al-Ḥurḡānī, *Dalā'il* 159-60; al-Qazwīnī, *Talḥīḡ* 200-1; and al-'Abbāsī, *Ma'āthid* I, 285-6.

²³ In support of this interpretation, al-Ḥurḡānī quotes an anecdote by Ibn 'Aṭīk with the construction: *fa-'ahwaytu nahwa ṣ-ṣawt fa-'adribuhu bi-s-sayf...* Such usage of the imperfect is frequent in anecdotes, and is usually reserved for the most interesting part in the narration, and is still alive in some Arabic dialects. al-Ḥurḡānī's shrewd observation is perfectly convenient to the context of as-Salūfī's line, which is anecdotal in nature.

²⁴ This is what al-Ḥurḡānī refers to as *taḡaddud*, and brings as the basic argument in interpreting another *šāhid*: *ba'aqīl 'ilayya 'arḡahum yatawassamu (Dalā'il* 135-6), where *mutawassiman* would not be appropriate, since it annuls the intended *taḡaddud*.

²⁵ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 379; Ibn Ya'qūb, *Šarḥ* III, 103; Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* 309; and as-Suyūfī, *Šarḥ* 719-20.

²⁶ al-Ḥurḡānī, *Dalā'il* 260-1; al-Qazwīnī, *Talḥīḡ*'s margin 140-1; and as-Sakkākī, *Miftāḥ* 291-2.

to what grammar stipulates (*'alladī yaqtadīhi 'ilm an-naḥw*)²⁷ This ingenious formulation of the relationship between the two disciplines holds the key to much of our understanding of the split which occurred in linguistic study and of the *raison d'être* of *'ilm al-ma'ānī*; namely, the grammarians' default in restricting their study to one aspect of *naẓm*; i.e. form, at the expense of the other side of the coin, meaning.

The following examples demonstrate how a grammarian allows the violation of a rule when the meaning required by the construction so necessitates. Such examples are contrary to the general practice whereby a grammarian rejects or interprets a certain usage which does not conform to the rule applicable to the majority of similar cases. This adherence to *qiyās* is said to have been more characteristic of Basran than of Kufan methods, but even if this could be confirmed from the original sources — which is extremely difficult except for a few cases, and is beyond the scope of the present paper — it is largely immaterial here, as the main Kufan argument for accepting usage rejected by the Basrans was not based on the meaning of the utterance or the *ṣāhid*, but on their acceptance of anomalous material and of unverified *riwāyas* which the Basrans rejected. The instances provided here are not examples of such factional controversies which are widespread in the sources and do not relate to the dimension of meaning, but cases in which grammarians give meaning predominance over form and grammatical rules, a method widely applied by rhetoricians but hardly by grammarians:

1. In the chapter *hādā bāb mā yuḥtār fīhi n-naṣb li-'anna l-'āḥir laysa min naw' al-'awwal*, Sībawayhi explains that the *Ḥigāzīs* use the accusative for the noun after the exceptive particle in constructions like *mā fīhā 'aḥadun 'illā ḥimāran* because the two nouns, *'aḥad* and *ḥimār*, are not of the same *naw'*.²⁸ The use of the accusative is indeed reported by some grammarians as obligatory for *ḡumhūr al-'arab*.²⁹ This is an ideal situation for grammarians to reject any other usage on the grounds that it does not tally with the *qiyās*. However, Sībawayhi accepts the Tamīmī usage whereby the excepted takes the nominative, as in Ibn al-Ayham's line where *ḡayru* — which always takes the case of the noun after *'illā* in a similar construction with *'illā* — is in the nominative: *laysa baynī wa-bayna Qaysin 'itābun * ḡayru ṭa'ni l-kulā wa-ḍarbi r-riḡābi*. The reason for this is provided by Sībawayhi himself, who refers to *al-Ḥatīf*'s explanation that the nominative in such usage is equivalent to that in 'Amr b. Ma'dī Karīb's line: *wa-ḥaylin qad dalaftu lahā bi-ḥaylin * taḥīyyatu baynihim ḍarbut waḡ'ū*, where *ḍarbi* is itself the *taḥīyya*, and therefore *ṭa'n* is itself the *'itāb*. Formal considerations have obviously given way here to the supremacy of meaning.

2. Concerning the *raḡaz*: *wa-sāqiyayni miṭli zaydin wa-Ḥu'al * saqbāni maṣūqāni makuṣā l-'aḍal*, Sībawayhi admits the nominative in *saqbāni*, although

²⁷ al-Ḥurḡānī, *Dalā'il* 63 ff., esp. 64.3-4. al-Ḥurḡānī's theory on *naẓm* is significant to grammar from another perspective: the criterion of *ṣawāb* and *ḥata'*, since what is *ṣawāb* is, by definition, in agreement with the meanings and principles of grammar, in the widest sense proposed by al-Ḥurḡānī (*ma'ānī n-naḥw wa-'aḥkāmuhu*), and what is *ḥata'* is surely incompatible with these meanings and principles. Adherence to this distinction would have provided grammarians with a clear-cut principle for examining linguistic data, and saved grammar from the chaotic status in which authors bitterly differ on what is permissible and what is not.

²⁸ Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 363. Cp. al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* IV, 413. and Ibn Ya'īṣ, *Ṣarḥ* II, 80.

²⁹ Ibn 'Aqīl, *Ṣarḥ* I, 600, and al-'Uṣmūnī, *Ṣarḥ* 229.

it modifies *sāqiyayni* in the accusative (*Kitāb* I, 226). aš-Šantamarī's elucidation of this admission (*Tahṣīl* I, 226) leads the reader to believe that it stems from reasons related to *lafz*, since the *rāḡiz* could not have used the expected form *saqbayni mamšūqayni* as this would entail the form *maknūzay l-'aḡal* which damages the meter.³⁰ This superficial explanation misses the spirit of Sībawayhi's stand which transcends form and penetrates into the impact of form on meaning. What Sībawayhi is saying in this important paragraph is that the accusative, *saqbayni*, would have been the normal usage which accords with the *qiyās* adjectives follow, but the use of the nominative *saqbānt* is stronger (*'aqwā*), and although Sībawayhi does not elaborate on this point, it is clear that this strength is due to *isti'nāf* with which a new sentence is formed (but only due to his suppletive insertion, i.e. *humā saqbāni*). This new sentence serves as an answer to the query: who are the *sāqiyāni*, and hence shows the interest of the speaker or the one addressed — depending on the source of the query — in what the utterance started with, an interest which the ordinary use of the adjective cannot possibly express.

3. Several grammarians quote al-Ḥansā's line: *tarta'u mā rata'at hattā 'idā ddakarāt *fa-'innamā hiya 'iqbālun wa-'idbānu*, and offer two interpretations for the construction *hiya 'iqbālun wa-'idbānu*: either that the bereaved animal described is portrayed as being itself the *'iqbāl* and *'idbār* due to the frequency of its performing both actions, or that the expression has a missing element and the *taqdīr* is: *hiya ḡānu 'iqbālīn wa-'idbārīn*.³¹ Ibn Ğinnī, however, decisively prefers the first interpretation which he describes (*Ḥaṣṣā'is* II, 230) as *'aqwā*,³² and the comparison he makes between this line and a number of other *šawāhid* leaves no room for doubt as to how much this interpretation is stronger than the one with *taqdīr*. His preference of the interpretation based on meaning to the one based on the formal restructuring of the construction, and the zealous argument he makes, show what *'ilm al-ma'ānī* owes to grammar in way of separate comments and observation, though not as an uninterrupted method of study.³³ In fact, the discussion of al-Ḥansā's line in rhetorical books³⁴ — and probably the whole section of *al-maḡāz al-'aqlī* — is indebted to Ibn Ğinnī's views on this matter.

4. There are several instances in which a grammarian defends, on the grounds of meaning, what other grammarians consider as a syntactically objectionable construction. This should serve as a reminder of the presence, within what could be

³⁰ Cp. also aš-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 448.

³¹ Both interpretations are given by al-Mubarrad (*Muqtaḍab* III, 230) and Ibn aš-Šaḡarī (*'Amāli* I, 71). Sībawayhi (*Kitāb* I, 169) cites this line as an example of *sa'at al-kalām*, i.e. the first interpretation, but a thorough reading of his text shows that he also allows the second interpretation since he compares al-Ḥansā's line with another *šāhid*, that of Mutammim, which he explains by *istiḥṣāf* and *ihyā'isr*. al-Baḡdādī (*Ḥizāna* I, 207) mentions a third interpretation; namely, that the verbal noun must be interpreted here as an active participle, with the sense of *hiya muqbilatun wa-mudbiratun*. This possibility is also mentioned by as-Sīrāfi in his *Šarḥ* (*Kitāb's* margin I, 169). As for Ibn al-'Anbārī, he offers the second interpretation only in his *'Aḡḍā*, 249.

³² Cp. Ibn Ğinnī, *Ḥaṣṣā'is* III, 189.

³³ Note, for example, how Ibn Ğinnī's *Luma'* is a purely grammatical work with little to distinguish it from other books of grammar in content and method.

³⁴ See al-Ġurḡānī, *Dalā'il* 233-4, and al-Qazwīnī, *Tahṣīl's* margin 47-8.

called the circle of grammarians, of a dissenting voice from time to time, but, admittedly, neither vehement nor frequent enough to constitute a corrective movement in the established grammatical methods. Examples of these syntactical views are the following:

a. On the question of the permissibility of suffixing to the *fā'il* a pronoun that refers to a subsequent *maf'ūl bihi*, as in *zāna nawruhu š-šagāra* or *daraba ġulāmuhu zaydan*, the *ġumhūr* is reported to be unanimous on its rejection, with the exception of Ibn Ġinnī on the authority of al-'Aḥfaṣ, and of a certain 'Abū 'Abdallāh at-Ṭuwāl (d.243).³⁵ The grammarians' rejection of such usage comes in spite of the abundance of its poetic *šawāhid* (five in the *'Alfiyya šurūḥ*, and several other lines in other sources). For Ibn Ġinnī, however, the 'iġmā' of the grammarians is irrelevant, as he asserts (*Haṣā'iṣ* I, 293-8) that the *hā'* of *rabbuhu* in 'Abū l-'Aswad's line: *ġazā rabbuhū 'annī 'Adiyya bna Ḥātīmin * ġazā'a l-kilābi l-'āwiyāti wa-qaḍ ja'al* does refer to 'Adiyy. The lengthy syntactical discussion that follows clearly shows how Ibn Ġinnī scorns the rules set by the grammarians when these rules fail to take the significance attached to the syntactical arrangement into account.

b. Grammarians unanimously agree that *kāna* is otiose or superfluous (*zā'ida*) in al-Farazdaq's line: *fa-kayfa 'idā ra'aytu diyāra qawmin * wa-ġirānin lanā kānū kirāmi*,³⁶ and thus its omission has no bearing on meaning. al-Mubarrad reports (*Muqtaḍab* IV, 117) that all grammarians interpret the line as a *šāhid* of otiose *kāna*, but defiantly announces that he has a different interpretation, whereby *lanā* syntactically belongs to *kāna*, and not to *ġirānin*, hence: "*wa-ġirānin, lanā kānū, kirāmi*", rather than "*wa-ġirānin lanā, kānū, kirāmi*". The rule on the redundancy of *kāna* is thus superseded by the meaning of the construction, and by no other than al-Mubarrad, one of the grammarians most fond of form and operants throughout his work.

c. The *ġumhūr* of grammarians is reported not to allow constructions such as *marartu ġālisatan bi-Hindin* where the circumstantial accusative precedes the genitive noun it refers to.³⁷ Accordingly, different interpretations are suggested for 'Urwa b. Ḥizām's line *la-'in kāna bardu l-mā'i ḥaymāna šādīyan * 'ilayya ḥabīban 'innahā la-ḥabību*, all of which — as al-Baġdādī and al-'Aynī note — to avoid admitting that this construction is permissible. In fact, acceptance of such constructions, despite the grammarians' unanimity, is attributed by Ibn Barhān to 'Abū 'Alī al-Fārisī and Ibn Kaysān (Ibn an-Nāẓim, *Šarḥ* 323)³⁸ and although no reason is given for this acceptance, it is highly probable that it is based on the particularity of meaning the construction has, since it obviously differs from its counterpart in which the accusative follows the noun, as in *marartu bi-Hindin ġālisatan* and *ḥabīban 'ilayya*.

³⁵ Those reporting the *ġumhūr*'s unanimity include Ibn aš-Šaġarī (*Amāll* I, 101-2); Ibn 'Aqīl (*Šarḥ* I, 493); al-'Uṣmūnī (*Šarḥ* 178); Ibn Hišām (*Awḍāḥ* II, 125); Ibn Ya'qūb (*Šarḥ* I, 76); al-'Aynī (*Maqḍis* II, 489); and as-Suyūṭī (*Ham'* I, 66).

³⁶ See, for example, Sībawayhi, *Kirāb* I, 289; Ibn al-'Anbārī, *Asrār* 136; al-Ġurġānī, *Awāmil* 252; Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī* 287; and al-Baġdādī, *Ḥizāna* IV, 37.

³⁷ For discussion of such constructions, see aš-Šan'ānī, *Tahdīb* 225-6; Ibn 'Aqīl, *Šarḥ* I, 640-3; al-'Uṣmūnī, *Šarḥ* 248-9; al-Baġdādī, *Ḥizāna* I, 533-6; and al-'Aynī, *Maqḍis* III, 156-60.

³⁸ See other *šawāhid* of this phenomenon: Ibn an-Nāẓim, *Šarḥ* 323-5.

Apart from its importance in clarifying the rise and growth of linguistic sciences, and in our understanding of the scope defined for its various constituents, the comparative study of *šawāhid* is extremely significant from another perspective rarely given the attention it deserves by modern scholarship; namely, the pedagogical implications of the complexity of grammatical material taught in the Arab world at the secondary and university levels. Most *šawāhid* are loaded with various possibilities different grammarians suggest at the formal level, largely ignoring contexts and nuances. The characteristically *balāġī* approach to *šawāhid*, when applied consistently and with little concern for anomalies and irregularities, would enhance the significance of this wealthy data, and facilitate its study so as to make it less repulsive to students. In an earlier study (Baalbaki 1986:7-17), the present author examined the *šawāhid* of *wāw al-ma'īyya* according to the meaning the construction acquires with the subjunctive or indicative verb following the *wāw*. Regardless of the results of that study, it demonstrated how a given sample of *šawāhid* can be freshly examined by giving priority to meaning and context, rather than making them subservient to form and *ʾrāb*. Much can be done in this domain to restore to grammar what rightfully belongs to it: *ʾilm al-maʾānt*, and the focal point in this has to be the available corpus of *šawāhid*.

REFERENCES

A. Primary sources

- al-ʿAbbāsī, *Maʾāhid* = ʿAbdarrāhīm b. ʿAḥmad al-ʿAbbāsī: *Maʾāhid at-tanṣiṣ ʿalā šawāhid at-talḥiṣ*. Ed. by Muḥammad Muḥyī d-Dīn ʿAbdalḥamīd. Cairo: al-Maktaba at-Tiġāriyya, 1947.
- al-ʿAynī, *Maqāṣid* = ʿAbū Muḥammad Maḥmūd b. ʿAḥmad al-ʿAynī: *al-Maqāṣid an-naḥwiyya fī šarḥ šawāhid šurūḥ al-ʿAlfiyya*. [In *Hizāna*'s margin, Būlāq, 1299 A.H.]
- al-Baġdādī, *Hizāna* = ʿAbdalqādir b. ʿUmar al-Baġdādī: *Hizānat al-ʿadab wa-lubb lubāb lisān al-ʿarab*. Būlāq, 1299 A.H.
- al-Farrāʾ, *Maʾānt* = ʿAbū Zakariyyāʾ Yaḥyā b. Ziyād al-Farrāʾ: *Maʾānt l-Qurʾān*. Ed. by Muḥammad ʿAlī an-Naġġār. Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya, 1955-72.
- al-Ġurġānī, *ʿAwāmil* = ʿAbū Bakr ʿAbdalqāhir b. ʿAbdarrāḥmān al-Ġurġānī: *al-ʿAwāmil al-miʾa an-naḥwiyya*, bi-šarḥ Ḥālid al-ʿAzharī. Ed. by al-Badrāwī Zahrān. Cairo: Dār al-Maʾārif, 1988.
- al-Ġurġānī, *Dalāʾil* = ʿAbū Bakr ʿAbdalqāhir b. ʿAbdarrāḥmān al-Ġurġānī: *Dalāʾil al-ʾiġāz*. Ed. by Muḥammad Rašīd Riḍā. Repr. from the Cairo edition, Beirut: Dār al-Maʾrifa, 1981.
- al-Ġurġānī, *Muqtaṣid* = ʿAbū Bakr ʿAbdalqāhir b. ʿAbdarrāḥmān al-Ġurġānī: *Kitāb al-muqtaṣid fī šarḥ al-ʾIdāḥ*. Ed. by Kāzim Baḥr al-Marġān. Baghdad: Dār ar-Rašīd li-n-Našr, 1982.
- Ibn al-ʿAnbārī, *ʿAsrār* = ʿAbū l-Barakāt ʿAbdarrāḥmān b. Muḥammad Ibn al-ʿAnbārī: *ʿAsrār al-ʿarabiyya*. Ed. by Muḥammad Bahġat al-Bīlār. Damascus: Maṭbaʿat at-Taraqqī, 1957.

- Ibn al-'Anbārī, *Nuzha* = 'Abū l-Barakāt 'Abdarrahmān b. Muḥammad Ibn al-'Anbārī: *Nuzhat al-'alibbā' fī ṭabaqāt al-'udabā'*. Ed. by Ibrāhīm as-Sāmarrā'ī. Baghdad: Maktabat al-'Andalus, 1970.
- Ibn 'Aqīl, *Šarḥ* = Bahā' ad-Dīn 'Abdallāh Ibn 'Aqīl: *Šarḥ Ibn 'Aqīl 'alā 'Alfiyyat Ibn Mālik*. Ed. by Muḥammad Muḥyī d-Dīn 'Abdalḥamīd. Cairo: al-Maktaba at-Tiġāriyya, n.d.
- Ibn Fāris, *Kitāb aš-šif'r* = 'Abū 'Alī al-Ḥasan b. 'Aḥmad Ibn Fāris: *Kitāb aš-šif'r 'aw Šarḥ al-'abyāt al-muškilat al-'irāb*. Ed. by Maḥmūd Muḥammad at-Ṭanāḥī. Cairo: Maktabat al-Ḥānġī, 1988.
- Ibn Ġinnī, *Ḥašā'iš* = 'Abū l-Faṭḥ 'Uṭmān Ibn Ġinnī: *al-Ḥašā'iš*. Ed. by Muḥammad 'Alī an-Naġġār. Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya, 1952-56.
- Ibn Ġinnī, *Luma'* = 'Abū l-Faṭḥ 'Uṭmān Ibn Ġinnī: *al-Luma' fī l-'arabiyya*. Ed. by H. M. M. Šaraf. Cairo: 'Ālam al-Kutub, 1979.
- Ibn Hišām, *'Awḍaḥ* = 'Abū Muḥammad Ġamāl ad-Dīn 'Abdallāh b. Yūsuf Ibn Hišām: *'Awḍaḥ al-masālik 'ilā 'Alfiyyat Ibn Mālik*. ed. by Muḥammad Muḥyī d-Dīn 'Abdalḥamīd. Cairo: al-Maktaba at-Tiġāriyya, 1956.
- Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī* = 'Abū Muḥammad Ġamāl ad-Dīn 'Abdallāh b. Yūsuf Ibn Hišām: *Muġnī l-labīb 'an kutub al-'a'arīb*. Ed. by Muḥammad Muḥyī d-Dīn 'Abdalḥamīd. Cairo: al-Maktaba at-Tiġāriyya, 1959.
- Ibn an-Nāzim, *Šarḥ* = 'Abū 'Abdallāh Badr ad-Dīn Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Mālik Ibn an-Nāzim: *Šarḥ 'Alfiyyat Ibn Mālik*. ed. by 'A. H. S. M. 'Abdalḥamīd. Beirut: Dār al-Ġīl, n.d.
- Ibn Rašīq, *'Umda* = 'Abū 'Alī al-Ḥasan Ibn Rašīq: *al-'Umda fī šinā'at aš-šif'r wa-naqḍihi*. Ed. by Muḥammad Muḥyī d-Dīn 'Abdalḥamīd. Repr. from the Cairo edition, Beirut. Dār al-Ġīl, 1972.
- Ibn aš-Šaġarī, *'Amālī* = 'Diyā' ad-Dīn 'Abū s-Sa'ādāt Hibatallāh b. 'Alī Ibn aš-Šaġarī: *al-'Amālī aš-Šaġariyya*. Hyderabad, 1349 A.H.
- Ibn Ya'īs, *Šarḥ* = Muwaffaq ad-Dīn Ya'īs b. 'Alī Ibn Ya'īs: *Šarḥ al-Mufaššal*. Cairo: al-Maṭba'a al-Muniriyya, n.d.
- al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* = 'Abū l-'Abbās Muḥammad b. Yazīd al-Mubarrad: *al-Muqtaḍab*. Ed. by Muḥammad 'Abdalḥālīq 'Uḍayma. Cairo: Dār at-Taḥrīr, 1965-68.
- al-Qazwīnī, *Talḥiṣ* = Ġalāl ad-Dīn Muḥammad b. 'Abdarrahmān al-Qazwīnī: *at-Talḥiṣ fī 'ulūm al-balāġa*. Ed. by 'Abdarrahmān al-Barqūqī. Repr. from the Cairo edition, Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-'Arabī, n.d.
- as-Sakkākī, *Miftāḥ* = 'Abū Ya'qūb Yūsuf b. 'Abī Bakr Muḥammad b. 'Alī as-Sakkākī: *Miftāḥ al-'ulūm*. Ed. by Na'īm Zarzūr. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1983.
- aš-Šan'ānī, *Tahdīb* = Sābiq ad-Dīn Muḥammad b. 'Alī b. 'Aḥmad b. Ya'īs aš-Šan'ānī: *at-Tahdīb al-wasīl fī n-naḥw*. Ed. by F. S. S. Qaddāra. Beirut: Dār al-Ġīl, 1991.
- aš-Šantamarī, *Nukat* = 'Abū l-Ḥaġġāġ Yūsuf b. Sulaymān b. 'Īsā aš-Šantamarī: *an-Nukat fī tafsīr Kitāb Sibawayhi*. Ed. by Zuhayr 'A. M. Sulṭān. Kuwait, Maḥad al-Maḥtūṭāt al-'Arabiyya, 1987.
- aš-Šantamarī, *Tahṣīl* = 'Abū l-Ḥaġġāġ Yūsuf b. Sulaymān b. 'Īsā aš-Šantamarī: *Tahṣīl 'ayn ad-ḍahab min ma'dīn ġawhar al-'adab fī 'ilm maġzāt al-'arab*. [in *Kitāb*'s margin, Būlāq, 1316-17 A.H.]

- Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* = 'Abū Bišr 'Amr b. 'Ulmān Sībawayhi: *al-Kitāb*. Būlāq, 1316-17 A.H.
- as-Sīrāfi, *Šarḥ* = 'Abū Sa'īd al-Ḥasan b. 'Abdallāh as-Sīrāfi: *Šarḥ Kitāb Sībawayhi*. [in *Kitāb*'s margin, Būlāq, 1316-17 A.H.]
- as-Suyūṭī, *Ḥam'* = Ġalāl ad-Dīn 'Abū l-Faḍl 'Abdarrahmān b. 'Abī Bakr as-Suyūṭī: *Ḥam' al-hawāmi' šarḥ Ġam' al-ġamāmi' fī 'ilm al-'arabiyya*. Cairo: Maṭba'at as-Sa'āda, 1327 A.H.
- as-Suyūṭī, *Šarḥ* = Ġalāl ad-Dīn 'Abū l-Faḍl 'Abdarrahmān b. 'Abī Bakr as-Suyūṭī: *Šarḥ šawāhid al-Muġnī*. Ed. by Muḥammad Maḥmūd aš-Šinqīṭī. Damascus, 1966.
- al-'Ušmūnī, *Šarḥ* = 'Abū l-Ḥasan 'Alī b. Muḥammad al-'Ušmūnī: *Šarḥ al-'Ušmūnī 'alā 'Alfiyyat Ibn Mālik al-musammā Manḥağ as-sālik 'ilā 'Alfiyyat Ibn Mālik*. Ed. by Muḥammad Muḥyī d-Dīn 'Abdalḥamīd. Cairo: Dār al-Kitāb al-'Arabī, 1955.

B. Secondary sources

- Baalbaki, Ramzi. 1983. "The relation between *naḥw* and *balāğ*: a comparative study of the methods of Sībawayhi and Ğurġānī". *ZAL* 11. 7-23.
- . 1986. "On the meaning of the *wāw al-ma'iyya* construction". *JAATA* 19. 7-17.
- Ḥaddād, Ḥannā Ġamīl. 1984. *Mu'ğam šawāhid an-naḥw aš-šif'iyya*. Riyad: Dār al-'Ulūm.
- Hārūn, 'Abdassalām. 1972-73. *Mu'ğam šawāhid al-'arabiyya*. Cairo: Maktabat al-Ḥānğī.
- Husayn, 'Abdalqādir. 1975. *'Aṭar an-nuḥāt fī l-baḥṭ al-balāğī*. Cairo: Dār Nahḍat Mişr.